

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

Please add the new attached sheet of drawings which includes Figure 1.

Attachment: New Sheet

**REMARKS**

Claims 9-19 are pending in the application. By this Amendment, the specification is amended and one new drawing figure is added. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

**FORMAL MATTERS**

The Office Action objects to the application because it lacks any drawing figures. By this Amendment, Applicants propose to add new Figure 1 to the application. In addition, the specification is amended to insert appropriate Section headers, to add a brief description of new Figure 1, and so that the description refers to the reference numbers appearing in Figure 1.

Because the features which are illustrated in Figure 1 were fully described in the original application, and because the specification is only being amended to add section headers, a brief description of Figure 1, and the reference numerals corresponding to what is shown in Figure 1, it is respectfully submitted that the addition of Figure 1 and the changes to the specification do not add any new matter to the application. Entry of the Amendment and withdrawal of the objection to the application due to a lack of a drawing figure are respectfully requested.

The Office Action also objects to the disclosure of the application under 37 C.F.R. §1.71. In particular, the Office Action questions the use of the term "desorption." Desorption is a commonly understood term which refers to a process which occurs when a reversibly dehydratable material releases water in the form of water vapor. Thus, desorption is the opposite of adsorption, which is where the reversible dehydratable material absorbs water. A copy of a printout

from the Wikipedia website which describes “desorption” is enclosed herewith to show that desorption is a commonly understood term for the process described above. In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of the objection to the specification under 37 C.F.R. §1.71 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action also rejects claims 9-19 under 35 USC §112 first and second paragraphs. It appears this rejection was made because the application did not include a drawing figure. In view of the fact that a new drawing figure has been added to the application by this Amendment, withdrawal of the rejections under §112 is respectfully requested.

**CLAIMS 9-12 AND 16-18**

The Office Action rejects claims 9-12 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Weichselgartner (U.S. Patent No. 4, 741,882). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Weichselgartner reference is directed to an apparatus used to extract radioactive gases such as tritium from closed working spaces such as an experimental glove box or a caisson. Figure 1 of this reference discloses the basic configuration for the system. As shown therein, an experimental working space 14 would house experimental activities which produce radioactive gases such as tritium. First and second separate sorption chambers 46a and 46b are selectively coupled to the interior of the working space 14 by a set of pipes and valves.

Weichselgartner explains that when it is necessary to remove radioactive gases from within the working space 14, the first sorption chambers 46a would be connected to the working space 14, and a blower 20 would blow the radioactive gas within the working space 14 into the first sorption chamber 46a. A material within the sorption chamber would adsorb the radioactive gases.

When sensors indicate that the material within the first sorption chamber is no longer effective at removing the radioactive gases, the valves would be switched so that the gases from within the working space 14 are instead routed to the second sorption chamber 46b. While the second sorption chamber 46b is being used to absorb the radioactive gases from the working space 14, the radioactive gases would then be removed from the material in the first sorption chamber 46a. Specifically, valves would be switched so that the first sorption chamber 46a is connected to a separate common unit 12 which includes radioactive material collection devices 60, 66. A vacuum would be applied to the first sorption chamber 46a by a high pressure vacuum pump 52 to cause the material in the first sorption chamber 46a to release the radioactive gasses which have been collected. Once a substantial amount of the radioactive gases been removed from the material in the first sorption chamber 46a, the first sorption chamber 46a would then be ready for re-use in removing radioactive gases from the working space 14.

Independent claim 9 is directed to a method for operating a device. Claim 9 recites subjecting items retained in the device to a drying step after the items have undergone a treatment step, as a result of which moisture remains on the items. Claim 9 recites that the drying step would include drawing air from a treatment chamber through a sorption column and thereafter guiding the air that is passed through the sorption column back into the treatment chamber. The sorption column contains a reversibly dehydratable material that operates to withdraw moisture from the air during the passage of the air through the sorption column.

Claim 9 further recites effecting desorption of the reversibly dehydratable material in the sorption column by drawing at least one of air from the treatment chamber and ambient air through the sorption column by means of an air accelerator means. Claim 9 recites that the air passing through the sorption column would be subjected to heating and that after the heated air has passed

through the sorption column, it would be guided back into the treatment chamber. The air guided into the treatment chamber during this step heats at least one of a treatment liquid to be applied to items retained in the device and the items themselves.

The Weichselgartner reference discloses a method which includes a step that is generally similar to the first step recited in claim 9. However, Weichselgartner fails to disclose or suggest a desorption step as recited in claim 9. As explained above, in the Weichselgartner desorption step, the radioactive gas which has been stored in a sorption chamber is removed to a separate exterior common unit. The radioactive gas removed from the sorption chamber is not returned to the treatment chamber of the Weichselgartner device. As a result, the gas removed from the material of the sorption chamber cannot be used to heat a treatment liquid or an item located within the treatment chamber. For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 9 is allowable over Weichselgartner. Claims 10-12 and 16-18 depend from claim 9 and are allowable for the same reasons, and for the additional features which they recite. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 9-12 and 16-18 is respectfully requested.

#### **CLAIMS 13-15**

The Office Action rejects claims 13-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Weichselgartner, in view of Tuck (U.S. Patent No. 3,034,221). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13-15 depend from claim 9. As explained above, Weichselgartner fails to disclose or suggest all the features of claim 9. Tuck fails to cure those deficiencies of Weichselgartner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 13-15 are allowable for all the reasons discussed above, and for the additional features which they recite. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13-15 is respectfully requested.

**CLAIM 19**

The Office Action rejects claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Weichselgartner, in view of Chamberlain (U.S. Patent No. 2,633,928). The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 19 is directed to a method of operating a dishwasher. Claim 19 recites a desorption step which is very similar to the desorption step of claim 9 discussed above. As noted above, Weichselgartner fails to disclose or suggest a desorption step as recited in claim 19. Chamberlain fails to cure this deficiency of Weichselgartner. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 19 is allowable for the reasons similar to those discussed above in connection with claim 9. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

**DOUBLE PATENTING REJECTIONS**

The Office Action rejects 9-18 under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 11-21 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/581,238. The Office Action also rejects claim 19 under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting over claims 13-23 of co-pending application Serial No. 10/564,230. Enclosed herewith is a Terminal Disclaimer to obviate the two double patenting rejections. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the above, entry of the present Amendment and allowance of Claims 9-19 are respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions regarding this amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned. If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Respectfully submitted,

/James E. Howard/

James E. Howard

Registration No. 39,715

August 26, 2009

BSH Home Appliances Corporation  
100 Bosch Blvd.  
New Bern, NC 28562  
Phone: 252-639-7644  
Fax: 714-845-2807  
james.howard@bshg.com